APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,574	10/28/2007	John G. Hildebrand	CCPC 0122 PUSA3	3032

50764   7590   04/25/2011
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 TOWN CENTER
TWENTY-SECOND FLOOR
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075

EXAMINER
CHEN, CAI Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2425	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/25/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 March 2011*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *3-5,7-12 and 29-38* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *3-5, 7-12, and 29-38* _____ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

       1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date *03/10/2011 and 03/30/2011*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-5, 7-12, and 29-38 have

been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

2.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Vince (US 2002/0075954) in view of Unger (US 2002/0196939 A1)

Regarding claim 3, Vince discloses a method comprising:

demultiplexing a first digital transport stream to recover first and second

digital payloads that were each carried in the first digital transport stream prior to

demultiplexing (Fig. 1, el. 20, the demodulator is used to recover the first payload

[el. 32] and second payload [el. 34]);

transporting the second digital payload to a transcoder whose output is

connected to a multiplexer upon determining that a protocol associated with the

second digital payload is not in a set of one or more supported protocols (Fig. 1,

para. 8-9, para. 20, the second signal payload [el. 34] is determined to be not in a

SD signal MPEG 2 format, the second payload is inserted to a transcoder [el.

50+el. 60, i.e., re-scaler and encoder] whose output [el. 34'] is connected to a

multiplexer [el. 70]);

bypassing the transcoder and transporting the first digital payload to the

multiplexer (Fig. 1, the first digital payload [el. 32] is bypassing the path of

second digital payload [el. 34], and the first digital payload [el. 32] is inputted to

the multiplexer [el. 70])

and multiplexing, at the multiplexer, the first digital payload and the

transcoded second digital payload to create a second digital transport stream

(Fig. 1, para. 8, para. 18, the multiplexer [el. 70] to multiplex the first digital

payload [el. 32] with the transcoded second digital payload [el. 34'] to create a

second digital stream [el. 75]).

transcoding, at the transcoder, the second digital payload to the protocol

associated with the first digital payload (Fig. 1, para. 8-9, para. 20, the second

signal payload [el. 34] is determined to be not in a SD MPEG 2 signal format, the

second payload is inserted to a transcoder [el. 50+el. 60, i.e., re-scaler and

encoder to be transcoded into SD MPEG 2 signal format [el. 34'] which

associates HD MPEG signal format [el. 32] in first digital payload);

Vince does not explicitly disclose bypassing the transcoder and

transporting the first digital payload to the multiplexer upon "determining that a

protocol associated with the first digital payload is in the set of one or more

supported protocols;"

Unger discloses bypassing a specific signal path and transporting the first

digital payload to the multiplexer upon "determining that a protocol associated

with the first digital payload is in the set of one or more supported protocols" (Fig.

18, para. 141-142, the demultiplexer [el. 1002] to inspect the signal packets of

the signal to determine signal stream for the main program only goes to the path

of FIFO [el. 1024])

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to

modify Vince to include Unger's demultiplexer in order to properly transports the

program signal to the correct path.

3.   Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Vince (US 2002/0075954) in view of Unger (US 2002/0196939 A1) and

further in view of Dureau (US 2003/0135860 A1).

Regarding claim 4, Vince in view of Unger discloses all limitation of claim

3,

Vince in view of Unger does not explicitly discloses wherein the protocol

associated with the first digital payload is older than the protocol associated with

the second digital payload and the second payload is transcoded to the older

protocols.

Dureau teaches wherein the protocol associated with the first digital

payload is older than the protocol associated with the second digital payload and

the second payload is transcoded to the older protocols (para. 35, para. 39, the

set top box has a demultiplexer to recover the first digital payload (MPEG 2

payload) and the second digital payload (MPEG 4), wherein the MPEG 2 protocol

is older than MPEG 4 protocol and MPEG 4 is to be transcoded into MPEG 2

format by a transcoder).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to

modify Vince in view of Unger to include Dureau feature in order to allow a

system to be compatible of displaying the MPEG 2 formatted video program

content.

Regarding claim 5, Vince in view of Unger discloses all limitation of claim

3,

Vince in view of Unger does not explicitly discloses wherein the protocol

associated with the first digital payload is less compressive than the protocol

associated with the second digital payload, and the second digital payload is

trancoded to the less compressive protocols.

Dureau wherein the protocol associated with the first digital payload is less

compressive than the protocol associated with the second digital payload, and

the second digital payload is trancoded to the less compressive protocols (para.

35, para. 39, the set top box has a demultiplexer to recover the first digital

payload (MPEG 2 payload) and the second digital payload (MPEG 4), wherein

the MPEG 2 protocol is less compressive than MPEG 4 protocol and MPEG 4 is

to be transcoded into MPEG 2 format by a transcoder).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to

modify Vince in view of Unger to include Dureau feature in order to allow a

system to be compatible of displaying the MPEG 2 formatted video program

content.

4.   Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Vince (US 2002/0075954) in view of Unger (US 2002/0196939 A1) and

further in view of Candolore (US 2005/0175178 A1).

Regarding claim 7, Vince in view of Unger discloses all limitation of claim

3.

Vince in view of Unger not explicitly disclose decrypting conditional access

(CA) encryption of the first transport stream prior to demultiplexing.

Candelore teaches disclose decrypting conditional access (CA) encryption

of the first transport stream prior to demultiplexing (Fig. 2, 5, and 8, el. 272-el.

288, para. 40-41, para. 60-64, para. 84-85, para. 94).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to

modify Vince in view of Unger set top box to include decrypting conditional

access (CA) encryption of the first transport stream prior to demultiplexing, as

taught by Candelore, in order to decrypt the TV signal so only the person is

authorized can access the TV content (para. 40-41).

Regarding claim 8, Vince in view of Unger further in view of Candelore

discloses decrypting the CA encryption of the first digital transport stream in a

settop box (STB) (Candelore, Fig. 2, 5, and 8, el. 272-el. 288, para. 40-41, para.

60-64, para. 84-85, para. 94).

Regarding claim 9, Vince in view of Unger discloses all limitation of claim

1, and further discloses step of demultiplexing the first transport stream,

transcoding the second digital payload, and multiplexing the first and transcoded

payloads occurs in the system (Vince, Fig. 1, para. 8-9, para. 20).

Vince in view of Unger does not explicitly discloses a card inserted into a

card slot of first interface device,

Candelore teaches discloses a card inserted into a card slot of first

interface device (Fig. 2, el. 10, a cable card containing the function of transcoder

is inserted in the STB receiver),

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to

modify Vince in view of Unger a card inserted into a card slot of first interface

device, in order to easily replace the cable card with another one if it goes bad.

5.   Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Vince in view of Unger and further in view of Candelore and further in view of

Park (5,757,909).

Regarding claim 10, Vince in view of Unger and further in view of

Candelore discloses all limitation of claim 9, and further discloses decode the

data stream prior to the demultiplexing, transcoding, and multiplexing (Vince, para. 8-9, para. 20, Fig. 1).

Dureau in view of Mao and further in view of Candelore does not explicitly disclose [decoding] copy protection of the first transport stream [in the card].

Park teaches [decoding] copy protection of the first transport stream [in the card] (Fig. 6-9, col. 13, lines 1-67, col. 14, lines 21-67).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Vince in view of Unger and further in view of Candelore to include [decoding] copy protection of the first transport stream [in the card], as taught by Park, in order to perform the illegal viewing and copy protection (col.14, lines 65-67).

6.   Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vince in view of Unger and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Park (5,757,909) and further in view of Orr (US 6,567,127 B1).

Regarding claim 11, Vince in view of Unger and further in view of Candelore and further in view of park discloses all limitations of claim 10.

Vince in view of Unger and further in view of Candelore and further in view of park does not explicitly disclose encoding copy protection to the second transport stream.

Orr teaches encoding copy protection to the second transport stream (Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 30-63).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Vince in view of Unger and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Park to include encoding copy protection to the second transport stream, as taught by Orr, in order to enhance the video data stream (col. 3, lines 50-52).

Regarding claim 12, Vince in view of Unger and further in view of Candelore and further in view of park and further in view of Orr discloses transmitting the copy protection encoded second transport stream from the card to the first interface device (Candelore, Fig. 2, the copy protection encoded signal is transmitted from the CP Encrypter of the cable card to the Host device [el. 14]).

7.   Claims 29 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Vince.

Regarding claim 29, Dureau discloses receiving, at a device, a first digital transport stream that contains a plurality of first digital payloads that are each formatted according to a first protocol and plurality of second digital payloads that are each formatted according to a second protocol, wherein the plurality of first digital payloads formatted according to the first protocol and the plurality of second digital payloads formatted according to the second protocol are multiplexed together in the first digital transport stream (para. 34-35, para. 39, the first transport stream are formatted in the protocol of MPEG 2 (first payload), and

MPEG 4 (second payload) and multiplexed together and being received at the

control unit of the NG receiver [el. 340]);

demultiplexing, at the device, the first digital transport stream to recover

the first digital payloads and the second digital payloads (para. 35 and para. 39,

the control unit to demultiplexed the first digital stream to recover the first payload

in MPEG 2 format and the second payload in MPEG 4 format);

transcoding each of the second digital payloads to be formatted according

to a protocol of the first payload (para. 35, the receiver [el. 340] has a transcoder

to transmit one format to other format, i.e., transcode MPEG 4 to MPEG 2),

Dureau does not explicitly discloses transcoding each of the second digital

payloads to be formatted according to a protocol that depends upon the first

protocol; and

multiplexing the first digital payloads with the transcoded second digital

payloads to create a second digital transport stream.

Vince teaches transcoding each of the second digital payloads to be

formatted according to a protocol of the first payload (Fig. 1, el. 20, the

demodulator is used to recover the first payload [el. 32] and second payload [el.

34]);

transcoding each of the second digital payloads to be formatted according

to a protocol that depends upon the first protocol (Fig. 1, para. 8-9, para. 20, the

second signal payload [el. 34] is determined to be not in a SD MPEG 2 signal

format, the second payload is inserted to a transcoder [el. 50+el. 60, i.e., re-

scaler and encoder] to be transcoded into SD MPEG 2 signal format [el. 34']

which depends HD MPEG signal format [el. 32] in first digital payload);

; and

and multiplexing, at the multiplexer, the first digital payload and the

transcoded second digital payload to create a second digital transport stream

(Fig. 1, para. 8, para. 18, the multiplexer [el. 70] to multiplex the first digital

payload [el. 32] with the transcoded second digital payload [el. 34'] to create a

second digital stream [el. 75]).

transcoding, at the transcoder, the second digital payload to the protocol

associated with the first digital payload (Fig. 1, para. 8-9, para. 20, the second

signal payload [el. 34] is determined to be not in a SD MPEG 2 signal format, the

second payload is inserted to a transcoder [el. 50+el. 60, i.e., re-scaler and

encoder to be transcoded into SD MPEG 2 signal format [el. 34'] which

associates HD MPEG signal format [el. 32] in first digital payload);

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to

modify Dureau to include Vince in order for a system to correctly process the

compatible MPEG 2 video program content and display to the user without any

error.

Regarding claim 32, the instant claim is analyzed with respect to claim 29.

8.   Claims 30, 33-34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore (US

2005/0175178 A1) and further in view of Kost (US 2002/01546941 A1).

        Regarding claim 30, Dureau in view of Mao discloses all limitation of claim

29.

        Dureau in view of Vince does not explicitly disclose prior to demultiplexing,

decoding the first transport stream to remove copy protection,

        After multiplexing, decoding the second transport stream to be copy

protected,

        Candelore teaches prior to demultiplexing, decoding the first transport

stream to remove copy protection (Fig. 1, el. 29, the transport stream is

decrypted at el. 29 prior to demultiplexing),

        It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to

modify Dureau in view of Vince set top box to include prior to demultiplexing,

decoding the first transport stream to remove copy protection, as taught as

taught by Candelore, in order to ensure that the copy protected content is only

accessed by the authorized persons (para. 40-41).

        Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore does not

explicitly disclose after multiplexing, decoding the second transport stream to be

copy protected,

        Kost teaches after multiplexing, decoding the second transport stream to

be copy protected (para. 46),

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore set top box to include after multiplexing, decoding the second transport stream to be copy protected in order to ensure copy protected content is only accessed by authorized users.

Regarding claim 33, the instant claim is analyzed with respect to claim 30.

Regarding claim 34, Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Kost discloses a second copy protection encoder configured to encode the first transport stream to be copy protected and transmit it to the first copy protection decoder (Candelore, Fig. 2, el. 28, CP Encrypter is to encode),

a second copy protection decoder configured to decode the second transport stream received from the second first copy protection encoder, so as to no longer be copy protected (Candelore, Fig. 2, el. 29, CP decryption to decode); and

a second demultiplexor configured to demultiplex the second transport stream received from the second copy protection decoder, to separate the first payloads from the second payloads (Candelore, Fig. 2, el. 30, the demultiplexer to separate two payload one going to el. 24, and other one goes to el. 31).

Regarding claim 36, Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Kost discloses all limitation of claim 33, and further discloses wherein the demultiplexor (Dureau, para. 39, Vince, Fig. 1), the transcoder (Dureau, para. 35, Vince, Fig. 1, transcoder), and the multiplexor are on a first hardware module (Dureau, para. 39),

Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Kost does not explicitly disclose first hardware module that is configured to be inserted into a receiver device that is configured to decode digital payloads formatted according to the second protocol.

and the first copy protection encoder, the first copy protection decoder are on a first hardware module,

Candelore one embodiment teaches first hardware module that is configured to be inserted into a receiver device that is configured to decode payloads formatted according to the second protocol (Fig. 2, el. 10, the cable card is to inserted to the receiver).

the first copy protection encoder (Candelore, Fig. 2, el. 28), the first copy protection decoder are on a first hardware module (Candelore, Fig. 2, el. 29),

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Kost include first hardware module that is configured to be inserted into a receiver device that is configured to decode digital payloads formatted according to the second protocol in order to easily to replace this module if it goes bad.

9.   Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore and Kost and further in

view of Orr (US 6,567,127 B1)

Regarding claim 31, Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of

Candelore and Kost discloses all limitation of claim 30,

Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore and Kost does

not explicitly discloses prior to demultiplexing and prior to decoding, encoding the

first transport stream to be copy protected;

after multiplexing and after encoding the second transport stream,

decoding the second transport stream no longer be copy protected; and

after decoding the second transport stream, demultiplexing the second

transport stream to recover the first and transcoded second payloads.

Candelore one embodiment teaches prior to demultiplexing(el. 30) and

prior to decoding (el. 34), encoding the first transport stream to be copy protected

(Fig. 1, el. 28);

after decoding the second transport stream (el. 29), demultiplexing (el. 30)

the second transport stream to recover the first and transcoded second payloads

(first payload goes to el. 34, and second payload goes to el. 31).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to

modify Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore and further in

view of Kost to include prior to demultiplexing and prior to decoding, encoding the

first transport stream to be copy protected and after decoding the second

transport stream, demultiplexing the second transport stream to recover the first

and transcoded second payloads; as taught by Candelore, in order to copy

protected the program file so only authorized user can access.

Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore and further in

view of Kost does not explicitly disclose after multiplexing and after encoding the

second transport stream, decoding the second transport stream no longer be

copy protected; and

Orr teaches after multiplexing (Fig. 1, el. 50) and after encoding the

second transport stream (el. 40, copy protection encoding), decoding the second

transport stream no longer be copy protected (el. 116, copy protection decoder);

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to

modify Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore and further in

view of Kost to include after multiplexing and after encoding the second transport

stream, decoding the second transport stream no longer be copy protected; as

taught by Orr, in order to remove the copy protected program content from

authorized user so he or she can watch the content.

10.   Claims 35, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Dureau in view of Vince in view of Candelore.

Regarding claim 35, Dureau in view of Vince discloses all limitation of

claim 32, and further discloses wherein the demultiplexor (Dureau, para. 39,

Vince, Fig. 1), the transcoder (Dureau, para. 35, Vince, Fig. 1, transcoder) and

the multiplexor are on a first hardware module (Dureau, para. 39, Vince, Fig. 1),

Dureau in view of Vince does not explicitly disclose first hardware module

that is configured to be inserted into a receiver device that is configured to

decode digital payloads formatted according to the second protocol.

Candelore teaches first hardware module that is configured to be inserted

into a receiver device that is configured to decode digital payloads formatted

according to the second protocol (Fig. 2, el. 10, the cable card is to inserted to

the receiver).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to

modify Dureau in view of Vince to include first hardware module that is

configured to be inserted into a receiver device that is configured to decode

payloads formatted according to the second protocol in order to easily to replace

this module if it goes bad.

Regarding claim 38, Dureau in view of Vince discloses all limitation of

claim 29, and further discloses wherein the demultiplexor (Dureau, para. 39,

Vince, Fig. 1), the transcoder (Dureau, para. 35, Vince, Fig. 1, transcoder) and

the multiplexor are on a first hardware module (Dureau, para. 39, Vince, Fig. 1),

Dureau in view of Vince does not explicitly disclose transmitting the

second digital transport stream to a device that is configured to receive transport

streams containing digital payloads formatted according to the first protocol.

Candelore teaches transmitting the second digital transport stream to a

device that is configured to receive transport streams containing digital payloads

formatted according to the first protocol (Candelore, Fig. 2, the second transport

stream is going from the cable card (el. 28) to the STB (el. 29), and the cable

card has the transcoder (el. 70) to format to the MPEG 2 protocol).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to

modify Dureau in view of Vince to include Candelore feature in order to easily to

replace this module if it goes bad.

11.   Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore (US 2005/0175178 A1)

and further in view of Krost and further in view of Iwamura (US 2003/0059047

A1).

Regarding claim 37, Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of

Candelore and further in view of Krost discloses all limitation of claim 36, and

further discloses wherein the demultiplexor (Dureau, para. 39), the transcoder

(Candelore, Fig. 2, el. 70), and the multiplexor are on a first hardware module

(Dureau, para. 39), the first copy protection encoder (Candelore, Fig. 2, el. 28),

the first copy protection decoder are on a first hardware module (Candelore, Fig.

2, el. 29),

Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore and further in

view of Krost does not explicitly disclose a first hardware module that is

configured to communicate with a second hardware module that contains the

second copy protection encoder, the second copy protection decoder, and the

second demultiplexor.

Iwamura teaches a first hardware module that is configured to

communicate with a second hardware module that contains the second copy

protection encoder, the second copy protection decoder, and the second

demultiplexor (Fig. 2, para. 17, para. 58-60, the set top box contains second

encryptor, decryptor, and demultiplexer are communicated to Pod card (first

module)).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to

modify Dureau in view of Vince and further in view of Candelore and further in

view of Krost to include teaches a first hardware module that is configured to

communicate with a second hardware module that contains the second copy

protection encoder, the second copy protection decoder, and the second

demultiplexor, as taught by Iwamura, in order to properly decoded the copy

protected content to the authorized users.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to CAI CHEN whose telephone number is

(571)270-5679. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Brian Pendleton can be reached on 571-272-7527. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CAI CHEN/
Examiner, Art Unit 2425

/Brian T Pendleton/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2425